

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

OFFICE OF

CLERK, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

800 MARKET ST., SUITE 130
KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE 37902

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

INSPECTED

RECEIVED

DEC 13 2017



neopost
12/05/2017

FIRST-CLASS MAIL
\$00.67

ZIP 37902
041L11218262

Clerk, U. S. District Court
Eastern District of Tennessee
At Knoxville

Return to Sender

Reasons: No longer here.....

No writing on address side.....

Missing full return address.....

Colors faded.....

Other.....

DELIVERED TO
U.S. M.S.

To appeal rejections go to WWW.BCSO.COM

37902-2303

NIXIE 372 DC 1 0012/10/17
RETURN TO SENDER
NOT DELIVERABLE AS ADDRESSED
UNABLE TO FORWARD
BC: 37902230330 *2859-10585-05-41

FILED

2017 DEC 13 A 11: 59

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DIST. TENN.

DEPT. CLERK

Randall Keith Beane 52505-074
BLOUNT COUNTY DETENTION CENTER
920 E LAMAR ALEXANDER PARKWAY
MARYVILLE, TN 37804

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Nos.: 3:17-CR-82-TAV-CCS-1
)	3:17-CR-82-TAV-CCS-2
RANDALL KEITH BEANE, and)	
HEATHER ANN TUCCI-JARRAF,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This criminal matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (the “R&R”) entered by United States Magistrate Judge C. Clifford Shirley, Jr., on November 16, 2017 [Doc. 62]. In the R&R, Magistrate Judge Shirley recommends that the Court deny the defendants’ motion to dismiss the indictment [Doc. 43] and deny the defendants’ many supplemental filings purporting to void the indictment and other parts of the record [Docs. 42, 45, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57]. On November 30, defendant Tucci-Jarraf filed a *pro se* document which the Court construes as raising objections to the R&R [Doc. 65]. Then, on December 1, defendant Tucci-Jarraf filed a “Declaration of Receipt, No Receipt, and Service,” which the Court also construes as raising objections to the R&R [Doc. 66].¹ Defendant Beane has moved to join both of defendant Tucci-Jarraf’s filings,

¹ In this filing, defendant Tucci-Jarraf asserts that she was served with a copy of the R&R on November 17, 2017 [Doc. 66 p. 1]. If so, then both documents were properly filed within the fourteen-day window for objections to the R&R. *See* Fed. R. Crim. P. 59(b)(2). The Court assumes this to be the case for purpose of this opinion.